

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-18 were pending in the application; rejected claims 1, 2, 8-12, 15 and 16 under 35 USC § 102(e); and rejected claims 3-7, 13, 14, 17 and 18 under 35 USC § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 6,839,878 to Icken et al.; 6,717,938 to D'Angelo; 6,563,517 to Bhagwat et al.; 6,807,534 to Erickson (References A-C and E, respectively, in the May 6, 2005 Office Action); and 6,557,039 to Leong et al. (Reference A in the October 31, 2005 Office Action) were cited. Claims 1-18 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Item 8 on page 2 of the October 31, 2005 Office Action referenced the May 6, 2005 Office Action with respect to the prior art rejections of claims 1-16. In items 5-9 on pages 2-6 of the May 6, 2005 Office Action, claims 1, 2, 8-12, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Icken et al. In the Response to Arguments on pages 5-7 of the October 31, 2005 Office Action it was asserted that "the display components [of Icken et al.] meet the limitations of a provision format" (October 31, 2005 Office Action, page 6, last 2 lines) because "the selection mechanism selects display components based on the resolved control structures" (October 31, 2005 Office Action, page 6, lines 15-16). However, this assertion ignores the differences between the display components of Icken et al. and how the provision format is associated with the provision information in the claimed invention.

To clarify the differences between the invention and Icken et al., all of the independent claims have been amended to recite that related information is obtained, transmitted and stored together "as one set of data" (e.g., claim 1, line 5). Specifically "provision information, recipient information relating to a recipient who is authorized to receive said provision information, and a provision format of said provision information to be applied to said recipient" (e.g., claim 1, lines 5-7) in claim 1 all undergo accepting, transmitting and registering operations as "the one set of data" (e.g., claim 1, lines 8 and 10). As a result, the appropriate format of the information is provided to each user in response to receipt of "a request and recipient information" (e.g., claim 1, line 12).

As stated at page 6, lines 1-2 of the October 31, 2005 Office Action, column 5, lines 2-4 of Icken et al. "states that the display is dynamically tied to the user's roles and the selected content." The dynamic nature of the system taught by Icken et al. is contrary to the claimed invention which associates the format of the data for a specific recipient with the data at the time that the data is accepted (see, e.g., claim 1, lines 5-7). This provides the benefits of simplicity

and assurance that the data format will be matched up with the recipient in an environment where multiple formats of data may be provided, as opposed to a variety of operations performed by users on displays, as in the case of the system taught by Icken et al.

Since claims 2, 8-12, 15 and 16 all recite various operations on "one set of data" it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 8-12, 15 and 16 patentably distinguish over Icken et al. for the reasons discussed above.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

In items 10-12 on pages 6-7 of the May 6, 2005 Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Icken et al. Since claim 3 depends from claim 2, it is submitted that claim 3 patentably distinguishes over Icken et al. for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2.

In items 13-15 on pages 7-9 of the May 6, 2005 Office Action, claims 4, 5 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Icken et al. in view of the D'Angelo. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 2 and claim 13 depends from claim 12. As discussed in the May 6, 2005 Office Action, nothing has been found in D'Angelo suggesting modification of Icken et al. to include restrictions based on format. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 4, 5 and 13 patentably distinguish over the combination of Icken et al. and D'Angelo for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 2 and 12.

In items 16-18 on pages 9-12 of the May 6, 2005 Office Action, claims 6, 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Icken et al. in view of Bhagwat et al. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 2 and claim 14 depends from claim 12. As discussed in the May 6, 2005 Office Action, nothing was cited or has been found in Bhagwat et al. suggesting modification of Icken et al. to restrict access by format of information provided to users. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 6, 7, and 14 patentably distinguish over Icken et al. in view of Bhagwat et al. for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 2 and 12.

In items 10-13 on pages 3-5 of the October 31, 2005 Office Action, claims 17 and 18 were rejected as unpatentable over Erickson in view of Leong et al. Erickson was cited as having taught "storing format information for each document to be provided" (October 31, 2005 Office Action, page 3, lines 9-10), while Leong et al. was cited as teaching use of "a delivery format attribute that tracks what document format is used for each user" (October 31, 2005 Office Action, lines 13-14). However, what was cited in Leong et al. was that "the actual format of the retrieved object is determined and checked against the requested delivery format required by the user" (column 9, lines 30-32). This suggests comparison of a **requested** format with the

format of the information requested. This is contrary to the claimed invention where, in a manner similar to the other independent claims, claim 17 now recites

storing, as one set of data ..., provision information accessible by authorized recipients, recipient information indicating what in the provision information each of the authorized recipients is authorized to receive, and format information corresponding to the provision information and the recipient information indicating in what format the provision information can be provided to each of the authorized recipients

(claim 17, lines 3-8, added words underlined). Nothing has been cited or found in either Erickson or Leong et al. teaching or suggesting that the information provided to users is stored with information regarding recipients authorized to receive that information and information regarding the format in which they should receive it. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 17 and claim 18 which depends therefrom patentably distinguishes over Erickson in view of Leong et al., as well as Icken et al., for the reasons discussed above.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-18 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/31/06

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 1/31/06, 2006
STAAS & HALSEY Richard A. Gollhofer
By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Date: 1/31/06